

Durham Research Online

Deposited in DRO:

09 October 2018

Version of attached file:

Accepted Version

Peer-review status of attached file:

Unknown

Citation for published item:

Hamilton, Tom (2018) 'The impact of Jacques Gillot's Actes du Concile de Trente (1607) in the debate concerning the Council of Trent in France.', in The Council of Trent : reform and controversy in Europe and beyond (1545-1700). Vol. 2: Between bishops and princes. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck Ruprecht, pp. 345-365. Refo500 Academic Studies., 2

Further information on publisher's website:

<https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666551086.345>

Publisher's copyright statement:

Additional information:

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in DRO
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full DRO policy](#) for further details.

The Impact of Jacques Gillot's *Actes du Concile de Trente* (1607) in the Debate Concerning the Council of Trent in France

Tom Hamilton*

At the conclusion of the Council of Trent in December 1563, the Council fathers' exhorted secular princes that the conciliar decrees should be "devoutly received and faithfully observed by them all". Yet only in July 1615 did the Assembly of the Clergy unilaterally publish the decrees of the Council in France, without royal approval and following decades of religious conflict.¹ This chapter examines a significant, and hitherto ignored, episode in the debate concerning Council of Trent in France, the 1607 publication in Paris of a volume titled the *Actes du Concile de Trente*.² Compiled by Jacques Gillot, *conseiller-clerc* in the Parlement of Paris, this octavo volume presented letters sent between the French monarchy and its ambassadors at the third period of the Council of Trent. It revealed how the Council failed in its task of reform and threatened the liberties of the Gallican Church. Gillot's volume divided opinion in Paris and at court, provoking those on either side of the debate concerning the Council of Trent in France to justify their positions. It outraged the papal nuncio, Cardinal Maffeo Barberini, and delighted Gillot's colleagues in the Parlement of

* For help in writing this chapter I would like to thank David Parrott, Lucy Whelan, and the participants at the conference session at Leuven on "Trent & Polarization: France", as well as Alfred Soman for his advice and permission to cite from his transcriptions in the Soman Collection held at the Jacob Burns Law Library, George Washington University (hereafter Soman Collection). Research for this chapter has been funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council UK and the Reynolds Fund of New College, University of Oxford.

¹ N.P. Tanner (ed.), *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils, Volume Two, Trent to Vatican II* (London: Sheed & Ward, 1990), 798. On the immediate reception of the Tridentine decrees after the Council of Trent see J. O'Malley, *Trent: What Happened at the Council?* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 2013), 250–1, 260–75; P. Sarpi, *Histoire du Concile de Trente (Edition originale de 1619)*, trans. P-F. Le Courayer, (eds.) M. Viallon/Bernard Dompnier (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2002), 1259–75; E. Mignot, *Histoire de la réception du Concile de Trente dans les différents Etats Catholiques* (Amsterdam, 1756), 2 vols. On the Assembly of the Clergy see J. Bergin, *The Politics of Religion in Early Modern France* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014), 83–5; J. Parsons, *The Church in the Republic: Gallicanism and Political Ideology in Renaissance France* (Washington D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2004), 227–73; J. Bergin, *Cardinal de La Rochefoucauld: Leadership and Reform in the French Church* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987), 51–5; V. Martin, *Le gallicanisme et la réforme catholique: Essai historique sur l'introduction en France des décrets du concile de Trente (1563-1615)* (Paris: A. Picard, 1919), 379–91.

² [J. Gillot (ed.)], *Actes du Concile de Trente en l'an MDLXII & LXIII* ([Paris], 1607). On Gillot see E. Picot, *Les français italianisants au XVI^e siècle* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1907), ii, 281–97.

Paris, informing subsequent histories of the Council composed in their milieu. Sections of this chapter explore in sequence the context, content, and reception of Gillot's volume. They demonstrate the polarising effect of the Council of Trent in France, even decades after its conclusion, and reveal the extent to which a controversial early modern publication shaped the source material for subsequent histories of the Council.

The Debate Concerning the Council of Trent in France

The Council of Trent presented major problems for the French monarchy before the first session even began, problems which continued throughout the three periods of the Council and laid the ground for the impact of Gillot's *Actes* decades later. As Alain Tallon has demonstrated, the French monarchy persistently challenged the Council's organisation, procedures, and results. It distrusted the dominance of the Emperor over proceedings at Trent and sought a different sort of Council, one convened not by the pope but by the members of the Church following Conciliarist principles, one that included the Protestants, and one that focused on ecclesiastical issues and steered well clear of challenging the authority of secular princes and the liberties of the Gallican Church, enshrined in the 1438 Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges and the 1516 Concordat of Bologna.³ The erudite jurist Pierre Pithou, a close friend and collaborator of Jacques Gillot, defined the liberties of the Gallican Church in his 1594 treatise on the subject under two fundamental points: that popes cannot make any command or ordinance concerning temporal matters in the French kingdom, and that, even though the pope is recognised as suzerain in spiritual matters, nevertheless he does not hold absolute power in this way in France, since he is bound by the canons and rules of the ancient Church

³ A. Tallon, *La France et le Concile de Trente (1518-1563)* (Rome: Ecole Française de Rome, 1997). A significant evaluation in English of Tallon's work is provided in a review by J. Bergin in *French History*, 14 (2000) 353–5.

councils held as law in that kingdom.⁴ Gallicans deployed these and similar arguments throughout the decades-long debate over the Council of Trent in France.

The conflicts of the Wars of Religion (c.1562-c.98) complicated any attempts to publish the Tridentine decrees in the French kingdom. The Cardinal of Lorraine, a leading figure in the third period of the Council, expected to oversee their publication immediately on his return to France, when a council of notables convened at Fontainebleau in February 1564 to discuss the issue. Yet he encountered stiff opposition from leading office-holders in the Parlement of Paris, who sought to protect their jurisdiction and Gallican liberties, as well as protests from the Queen Mother Catherine des Médicis and the chancellor Michel de L'Hospital, who insisted that the fractious state of the kingdom ruled out such an overtly confessional move at this moment, which would break apart years of fragile peace-making that culminated in the March 1563 Edict of Amboise.⁵ The return to civil war between the Surprise of Meaux in September 1567 and the aftermath of the Saint Bartholomew's Day massacre in August 1572 again made peace-making and conciliation the order of the day for the French monarchy. This left the publication of the Tridentine decrees as an alternative course pursued by those in favour of strongly confessional Catholic reform, above all the Cardinal of Lorraine.⁶ Advocates of reform in the French kingdom met at the Estates of Blois in 1576-7, when the clergy vigorously discussed the implementation of the Tridentine decrees, but divided over how this should be done.⁷ At the 1579 Assembly of the Clergy at Melun, clerics pressed Henri III on the publication of the decrees, but he evaded their

⁴ [P. Pithou], *Les libertez de l'Eglise Gallicane* (Paris, 1594), 2–3. The literature on Gallicanism is vast. See notably Parsons, *The Church in the Republic*; A. Tallon, *Conscience nationale et sentiment religieux en France au XVI^e siècle* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 2002); Martin, *Le gallicanisme et la réforme catholique*.

⁵ Martin, *Le gallicanisme et la réforme catholique*, 39–54; S. Daubresse, *Le Parlement de Paris, ou La voix de raison (1559-1589)* (Geneva: Droz, 2005), 218–9. On royal attempts to set in motion a peace-process see P. Roberts, *Peace and Authority during the French Religious Wars, c.1560-1600* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013).

⁶ On Lorraine's attempts in 1573 to build consensus in favour of the Tridentine decrees see M. Greengrass, *Governing Passions: Peace and Reform in the French Kingdom, 1576-1585* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 291.

⁷ Greengrass, *Governing Passions*, 99–101.

demands and relied instead on the 1579 Ordinances of Blois that enacted sixty-four articles concerning ecclesiastical matters, a programme characterised by Mark Greengrass as one of “indigenous, Gallican, pragmatic, royal reform”.⁸ The most forceful case for the publication of the Tridentine decrees at any stage in the civil wars was made by the Catholic League, formed in December 1584 by the Guise family and leading members of the French nobility with the support of Philip II of Spain, primarily in order to block the succession to the throne of the Protestant Henri de Navarre.⁹ Yet when a commission of office-holders in the Parlement of Paris met at the Estates General convened by the League in 1593, charged with determining whether the Tridentine decrees could be published in France, they firmly rejected several of the decrees as running counter to the liberties of the Gallican Church and ruled out their publication.¹⁰ Following his conversion to Catholicism and coronation, Henri IV repeatedly promised the papacy that he planned to publish the Tridentine decrees, but did not take decisive action on the issue as Gallican office-holders continued to assert their opposition.¹¹ Throughout these decades of civil war, the “most Christian” kings of France refused to publish the Tridentine decrees and instead followed their own national policy of reform.

Almost a decade after the Edict of Nantes which brought the civil wars to a close, Jacques Gillot built on the arguments of his colleagues in the Parlement in defence of the liberties of the Gallican Church, but he took a different approach to the debate concerning the Council of Trent in France. In 1606 when Gillot prepared the *Actes du Concile de Trente*, and in 1607 when it appeared, the subject of the Tridentine decrees seemed more pressing than

⁸ Greengrass, *Governing Passions*, 286–303.

⁹ Martin, *Le gallicanisme et la réforme catholique*, 214. On the place of Gallicanism and the Council of Trent in Leaguer thought see S. Nicholls, “Gallican Liberties and the Catholic League”, *History of European Ideas*, 40 (2014) 940–64.

¹⁰ A. Tarrête, “Un gallican sous la Ligue: Guillaume du Vair (1555–1621)”, *Revue de l’histoire des religions*, 3 (2009) 497–516, on pp. 501–4; Martin, *Le gallicanisme et la réforme catholique*, 258–69; Sarpi, *Histoire du Concile de Trente*, 1271–1273.

¹¹ Martin, *Le gallicanisme et la réforme catholique*, 303–343.

historians have so far remarked upon.¹² For Gillot, the moment seemed apt. He justified his project in a letter to the renowned humanist Joseph Scaliger since “people are beginning to talk about the Council of Trent again in France”.¹³ The occasion for these discussions arose in contemporary controversies over the extent of the pope’s temporal authority, one of the great unresolved questions of the Council.¹⁴ Debate on the subject of papal authority erupted into pamphlet warfare in two significant controversies in these years. The first of these is the conflict over the Venetian Interdict of 17 April 1606, by which Pope Paul V declared the Republic excommunicated in response to a succession of jurisdictional disputes, especially over the clergy; and the second is the dispute concerning the Oath of Allegiance issued by James VI and I on 22 June 1606, that demanded loyalty to the king and denied that the pope had any power to depose him. These controversies resonated in France as they had direct implications for the liberties of the Gallican Church when faced with an assertive papacy, and involved two of Henri IV’s closest diplomatic allies.¹⁵ Having travelled in Italy in his youth, and maintained a correspondence network in the peninsula, Gillot followed the Venetian Interdict controversy with particular attention.¹⁶ At this time of fraught theological-political debate, Gallican office-holders and intellectuals in Gillot’s circle – such as Jean de Villiers Hotman, Louis Turquet de Mayerne, and Guillaume Ribier – raised long-held irenic hopes for

¹² Martin, *Le gallicanisme et la réforme catholique*, 349 mentions Gillot’s publication only in passing, while Tallon, *Conscience nationale et sentiment religieux*, 16, 154–9 suggests that the Council of Trent had a mostly polemical significance in the decades after 1563.

¹³ P. Botley/D. van Miert (eds.), *The Correspondence of Joseph Justus Scaliger* (Geneva: Droz, 2012), vi, 502, [1606, after 4 August?]. For an overview of Gillot’s correspondence with Scaliger see Scaliger, viii, 84–5.

¹⁴ O’Malley, *Trent*, 271.

¹⁵ F. de Vivo, “Francia e Inghilterra di fronte all’Interdetto di Venezia” in M. Viallon (ed.), *Paolo Sarpi: Politique et religion en Europe* (Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2010) 163–88; S.H. de Franceschi, *La crise théologico-politique du premier âge baroque. Antiromanisme doctrinal, pouvoir pastoral et raison du prince: Le Saint-Siège face au prisme français (1607-1627)* (Rome: Ecole française de Rome, 2009), 128–202; S.H. de Franceschi, *Raison d’état et raison d’église. La France et l’Interdit vénitien (1606-1607): Aspects diplomatiques et doctrinaux* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2009); F. de Vivo, *Information and Communication in Venice: Rethinking Early Modern Politics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 157–248; C. Vivanti, *Guerre civile et paix religieuse dans la France d’Henri IV*, trans. L.-A. Sanchi (Paris: Desjonquères, 2006, first Italian edition, 1963), 164–165; W.B. Patterson, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 75–123; A. Soman, “Book Censorship in France (1599-1607) with Emphasis upon the Diplomatic Relations between Paris and Rome”, unpublished PhD thesis, Harvard University (1967), 154–82.

¹⁶ Picot, *Les français italianisants*, ii, 290–3.

the convening of a national council and the possibility of further reform and a reunion of the Church.¹⁷ Rather than directly address a contemporary controversy, or offer a plan for a national council or the reunion of the Church, Gillot drew on his historical erudition to critique what he understood to be a moment of failed reform caused by undue papal influence at the Council of Trent. Opposition to the Council continued to matter in these years, he suggested, because if resistance in the Parlement slipped, then the Tridentine decrees might be implemented at any moment, overruling Gallican liberties and dashing all hopes for further reformation and the reunion of the Church.¹⁸

Gillot's letters to the great Protestant humanist Joseph Scaliger indicate his plans for the *Actes du Concile de Trente* and its potential contribution to the debate concerning the Council in France. Gillot's first mention to Scaliger of his edition came in late 1606.¹⁹ He complained about delays in its publication caused by "these scoundrel printers ... who would rather make money printing songbooks and other follies, to have their three *sols* immediately".²⁰ It eventually appeared in late May 1607. George Carew, the English ambassador, told Robert Cecil that Gillot's work was published "around the time of my last dispatch", sent on 26 May 1607; Pierre de L'Estoile, the Parisian diarist and collector, acquired a copy on 28 May 1607; the papal nuncio, Cardinal Maffeo Barberini, complained of the publication in a letter to Cardinal Nephew Scipione Borghese on 29 May 1607.²¹ Gillot sent Scaliger a copy "as soon as possible" on 6 June 1607, having already sent some of the

¹⁷ Picot, *Les français italianisants*, ii, 293; Vivanti, *Guerre civile et paix religieuse*, 163–97; G.H.M. Posthumus Meyjers, "Jean Hotman's Syllabus of Eirenical Literature" in D. Baker (ed.), *Reform and Reformation: England and the Continent c. 1500-1750* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1979) 175–93; H. Trevor-Roper, *Europe's Physician: The Various Life of Sir Theodore de Mayerne* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006), 125–9; M. Greengrass, "The Calvinist and the Chancellor: The Mental World of Louis Turquet de Mayerne", *Francia. Forschungen zur Westeuropäischen Geschichte*, 34 (2007) 1–23; M. Venard, "Le projet d'un nouveau concile dans la France d'Henri IV" in M. Viallon (ed.), *Autour du Concile de Trente: actes de la table ronde de Lyon, 28 février 2003* (Saint Etienne: Publications de l'université de Saint-Etienne, 2006) 47–60.

¹⁸ Scaliger, vii, 390, [1608] 01 31.

¹⁹ Scaliger, vi, 502, [1606, after 08 04?].

²⁰ Scaliger, vi, 38, 1607 02 09.

²¹ London, The National Archives, Kew, State Papers 78/53, fol. 284r, Soman Collection; P.G. Brunet (ed.), *Mémoires-journaux de Pierre de L'Estoile* (Paris: Librairie des bibliophiles, 1878-1896) (hereafter Brunet), viii, 299; Vatican City, Archivio Segreto Vaticano (hereafter ASV), Fondo Borghese, II, 249, fols. 242r–3v, Barberini to Borghese, 29 May 1607.

pieces to Jacques Bongars, the French ambassador to the Empire.²² Above all, Gillot aspired to prove to his readers that the Council of Trent was illegitimate. He recalled decades of French hostility towards Trent by remarking that “I refuse to recognise a man not only as French, but as a man, if having read these pieces, which are truthful and of which we have the originals, he might still be able to give the assembly of Trent the name ‘Council’”.²³ By repeating this typical condemnation made by the French monarchy against the pope, Gillot outlined to Scaliger his aspirations for the impact his volume might make in the debate concerning the Council of Trent in France.²⁴

Jacques Gillot’s *Actes du Concile de Trente* (1607)

The 1607 imprint of the *Actes du Concile de Trente* only partially indicated Gillot’s agenda for the text. His apparently neutral title suggested that the book might reproduce the decrees of the Council, whereas his subtitle outlined more clearly the majority of its contents, “containing the Memoirs, Instructions, and dispatches of the French ambassadors together with the demands and Protestations they made at the said Council in the name of the most Christian King and the Gallican Church”. There is perhaps a polemical suggestion to his title, which recalls Jean Calvin’s libel *Les actes du concile de Trente avec le remede contre la poison* in its French translation, published in 1548 soon after the original Latin treatise. Calvin too claimed that Trent was not a true Council of the Church, but “a donkey wearing a lion’s skin”.²⁵ However, there is no direct evidence linking the publications. On the title page to Gillot’s 1607 volume and subsequent editions, a plain declaration called for readers’ attention: “Taken from the originals”. Gillot explained this strategy to Scaliger: “You shall

²² Scaliger, vii, 185, 1607 06 06. See above n.13. L’Estoile mentioned that Bongars sent material to Gillot – Brunet, ix, 118 – in this case a libel against the Jesuits.

²³ Scaliger, vii, 150, 1607 05 05.

²⁴ See eg. Tallon, *La France et le Concile de Trente*, 232.

²⁵ Tallon, *La France et le Concile de Trente*, 472–8, especially p. 476.

see that there is nothing of my own there: things are described by entirely authentic pieces, and I have before me the originals. I think that in this time it is necessary to explain things in this way, to oblige the readers to read the whole thing, in order to make them understand.”²⁶

In his thorough, historical research, Gillot drew on the techniques of legal humanism developed in sixteenth-century France by his colleagues and teachers in the milieu of the Parlement of Paris and the law faculties which trained its office-holders.²⁷ Gillot borrowed source material from these scholars, and he later remarked that François Pithou, brother of Pierre Pithou, supplied him with pieces for an expanded edition of the volume published in 1608.²⁸ Pierre de L’Estoile praised his friend and colleague, the Royal Secretary Christophe Justel, for following this approach in his edition of acts of the early Councils of the Church, the *Codex Canonum Ecclesiae Universae* (Paris, 1608), because the text contained “nothing that he composed himself ... yet it serves to cast the light of Roman antiquity onto the shadows of the present, at a time when people are closing their eyes to the truth”.²⁹ Gillot similarly produced a rigorous, erudite history that would be impossible to refute since it consisted only of scrupulously assembled documentary evidence.

Minor errors in the anonymous, hasty printing of the first edition of Gillot’s volume qualify his claim to a clear presentation of the original documents.³⁰ Printed unevenly on

²⁶ Scaliger, vii, 38, 1607 02 09. In Gillot’s 1608 expanded successor volume on the Council a longer statement of this point was impressed: [J. Gillot (ed.)], *Instructions et missiues des roys tres-chrestiens et de leurs ambassadeurs. Et autres pieces concernant le Concile de Trente* ([Paris], 1608), inside cover: “si quelqu’un juge que l’intention de celuy qui a faict ce Receuil, soit autre que pour apprendre à ceus de ce siecle, et representer à la posterité la verité de l’histoire du Concile de Trente, faire cognoistre l’auctorité et la Majesté des Rois Tres-Chrestiens, la grandeur du Royaume, la fidelité et courage des François, les droicts et libertez de nostre Eglise Gallicane, ou qui calomnie que rien aye esté adjousté, osté, diminué, ou changé des Originaux: Ainsi Dieu l’aide et le juge, comme il faict autrui.”

²⁷ G. Huppert, *The Idea of Perfect History: Historical Erudition and Historical Philosophy in Renaissance France* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1970); D.R. Kelley, *Foundations of Modern Historical Scholarship: Language, Law, and History in the French Renaissance* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1970).

²⁸ Scaliger, vii, 392-393, [1608] 01 31; Scaliger iv, 168-9, 1602 01 09.

²⁹ Brunet, x, 240.

³⁰ Gillot, *Actes*, the entry in the index for p. 143 has upside-down text; p. 195 begins “Lettre envoyee au Roy par messieurs du Ferrier & de Pibrac ses Ambassadeurs le 20 Septembre 1563” yet is signed off (p. 204) “De Trente ce 25 Septembre”; discontinuous page numbers at several points are particularly distracting for the reader.

several pages, the untidy octavo volume does not have the appearance of an erudite compilation. The text which I identify as a second edition corrected this impression with a neater title page, substantial corrections, and six additional pieces.³¹ Pierre de L'Estoile acquired both editions, the first in July 1607 soon after its initial release, and then the second edition from on 20 March 1608, noting the added content but not the improved format.³² If the first volume sold out quickly, perhaps Gillot sensed a marketing opportunity in presenting a slightly expanded and neater second edition.

L'Estoile identified the printer with the initials C. B., which he elsewhere expanded to C. Bérion. Historians of the book are familiar with the Bérion (or Berjon) family of printers, a dynasty of Protestants from Lyon and Geneva known for publishing works of religious controversy. Among them, Jean Bérion left Geneva to establish a shop in Paris c.1606 on the rue Saint Jean de Beauvais, just off the rue Saint Jacques, as well as a stall in the Galerie des Prisonniers of the Palais de Justice.³³ C. Bérion proves more elusive. Only L'Estoile mentions the existence of a member of the family in Paris with the initial C., perhaps concealing his full name because of his involvement with seditious publications.³⁴ L'Estoile first mentioned C. Bérion in a diary entry dated June 1605 as a “poor printer” imprisoned in Paris for five

³¹ Gillot, *Actes*, British Library, London, General Reference Collection 1607/1044, 251 pp., in-8°. Folios in the Lyon copy are marked A-Niiii whereas folios in the BL copy, labelled 1607, are marked A-Qiiii. Gillot mentioned plans to continue publishing these documents in Scaliger, vii, 185, [1607] 06 06, and sent the second volume along with Scaliger, vii, 390 [1608] 01 31. Further expanded editions are [Jacques Gillot (ed.)], *Instructions et missives des roys tres-chrestiens et de leurs ambassadeurs. Et autres pieces concernant le Concile de Trente* ([Paris], 1608, 1613).

³² Brunet, viii, 299, ix, 59, noting “C.B.” as the printer of the first edition and purchasing the second edition from his regular contact Jérémie Perrier. On L'Estoile and the Parisian print trade see F. Greffe/J. Lothe, *La vie, les livres et les lectures de Pierre de L'Estoile: Nouvelles recherches* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2002) and T. Hamilton, “Pierre de L'Estoile and his World in the Wars of Religion”, unpublished DPhil thesis, University of Oxford (2014).

³³ P. Renouard, *Répertoire des imprimeurs parisiens: libraires et fondeurs de caractères en exercice à Paris au XVIIe siècle* (Nogent Le Roi: Jacques Laget, 1995), 30; B. Lescaze, “L’infortune de Mathieu Berjon et l’ouverture du marché lyonnais, 1600–1625” in R. Durand ed., *C’est la faute à Voltaire, c’est la faute à Rousseau: Recueil anniversaire pour Jean-Daniel Candaux* (Geneva: Droz, 1997) 309–19; C. von Güttlingen, *Répertoire bibliographique des livres imprimés en France au seizième siècle* (Baden-Baden: Librairie Heitz, 2001), vii, 163–71. On his run-ins with the authorities in Geneva see I. Jostock, *La censure négociée: Le contrôle du livre à Genève, 1560-1625* (Geneva: Droz, 2007), 176-177, 191–2, 391, 401.

³⁴ J. Delatour, ‘De Pithou à Dupuy: Un siècle de religion politique’ in M.-M. Fragonard and P.-E. Leroy (eds.), *Les Pithou: Les lettres et la paix du royaume* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2003) 327–52, on p. 322 n.28 doubts whether C. Berion even exists, yet L'Estoile mentioned C. Bérion in his diaries on seventeen occasions and knew the Bérion print shop well: Brunet, xii, 37.

weeks on suspicion of having printed a badly-judged libel against the Jesuits, entitled *Consultation des doctes*.³⁵ Hoping to prevent a repeat performance, L'Estoile advised C. against printing a discourse on “The Impossibility of the Two Religions” on 28 September 1607.³⁶ Jean Bérion, however, did not learn from C.’s mistakes, and was arrested and imprisoned in the Châtelet on 30 September 1609 for publishing a libel titled *Secret des Jésuites* that L'Estoile dismissed as “a simple foppery and a nasty piece of slander, which was not worth printing”.³⁷ Despite these occasional rebukes, L'Estoile recognised both Jean and C. Bérion as friends and regular contacts, receiving from them books as gifts as often as they charged him, and he particularly acquired from C. Bérion editions of polemical theological-political works concerning the Venetian Interdict and the Dutch Revolt.³⁸ Despite its minor faults, later corrected, C. Bérion’s 1607 impression of Gillot’s *Actes du Concil de Trente* presented its case clearly enough and to an established, sympathetic audience of Parisian Gallican readers who might associate the anonymous imprint with a prickly intervention in contemporary religious controversy.

The evidence that Gillot amassed and reproduced appeared to him to be incontrovertible, demonstrating the frustrations felt by the French ambassadors to the Council through its debates and behind-the-scenes negotiations. Formal, public letters and proclamations issued by the king and his ambassadors during the third period of the Council dominate the volume (Table 1). Gillot arranged them in chronological order, beginning with the instructions sent to Louis de Saint Gelais, sieur de Lansac on his dispatch as the widely-accepted head of the delegation to the Council in April 1562, followed by letters addressed to him and the ambassadors Arnaud du Ferrier and Guy du Faur, sieur de Pibrac, both of whom

³⁵ Brunet, viii, 182–3, with the identity of the “pauvre imprimeur” C. Bérion confidently asserted in the manuscript: Médiathèque du Grand Troyes, ms. 1117, vol. 3 ‘Journal de Pierre de L’Estoile depuis le 17 janvier 1605 jusques au 18 mars 1607’, fols. 12–3.

³⁶ Brunet, viii, 343.

³⁷ Brunet, x, 30, 43.

³⁸ Brunet, viii, 231, ix, 36, 84, 116, 168, 171, 176, 180, 243–4.

were controversial choices as they were known for their sympathy towards the Protestants and a policy of religious toleration. Alongside pieces sent by or addressed to these ambassadors as a group appears correspondence between individual ambassadors, notably letters sent by Lansac to André Guillart, sieur de L'Isle, French ambassador in Rome.³⁹

Table 1. Origin and Destination of the Letters and Proclamations Published in Jacques Gillot (ed.), *Actes du Concile de Trente* (Paris, 1607).⁴⁰

Name	Sent	Received
Charles IX of France	12	4
Catherine des Médicis	1	2
'His Majesty's Ambassadors'	6	8
Louis de Saint Gelais, sieur de Lansac	19	1
Arnaud du Ferrier	8	1
Guy du Faur, sieur de Pibrac	3	1
André Guillart, sieur de L'Isle	1	18
Philibert Babou, sieur de La Bourdaisière	-	1
René de Birague	1	1
François de Balliers, abbé de Mannes	1	-
Pope Pius IV	-	5
Ferdinand I, Holy Roman Emperor	2	-
Maximilian II, Holy Roman Emperor	1	-
Imperial Ambassadors	2	-
Albrecht V, Duke of Bavaria	1	-
Charles II, Archduke of Austria	1	-

Gillot's collection first demonstrates the dispiriting failure of the French ambassadors to persuade the papal curia to begin a new Council with genuine aspirations for reform and

³⁹ Tallon, *La France et la Concile de Trente*, 340–2; N. Le Roux, *La faveur du roi: Mignons et courtisans au temps des derniers Valois (vers 1547 - vers 1589)* (Paris: Champ Vallon, 2000), 59–61; A. Jouanna, "André Guillart, sieur du Mortier, de l'Isle et de l'Épichelière", in R. Mousnier (ed.), *Le conseil du roi de Louis XII à la Révolution* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1970) 231–53.

⁴⁰ Some pieces have multiple senders and recipients, while others are general proclamations with no specified recipients.

the reunion of the Church.⁴¹ Charles IX in his instructions to Lansac repeated Henri II's call for a "new, free, Christian, general and legitimate Council, in a place with free and sure access ... to enable both the Catholic and Protestant Princes and States of Germany to send representatives: so that everything can be well digested, debated, reformed, and re-established, and we can remedy the maladies of the present, and reunite all of Christendom in one and the same religion".⁴² These goals soon met with failure and frustration in the first months of the third period of the Council.⁴³ Gillot presented correspondence revealing the insults and rebuffs dealt out during the day-to-day business of the Council in these months, as precedence disputes between French and Spanish representatives produced conflicts that erupted once again in his compilation. By only presenting the letters from the French perspective, Gillot published the French ambassadors' justifications for precedence, in their "traditional position as the first behind the Emperor", and ignored Spanish counter-claims.⁴⁴ Gillot selected reports which revealed the measured, analytical responses of the French ambassadors to the insults they received. In a letter dated 11 June 1562, Lansac relayed to Catherine des Médicis how Pius IV accused him of being "an Ambassador for the Huguenots" because of his allegedly "strange and new proposals", which he insisted had not formed part of any formal proposal to the Council, but instead appeared only in the ambassadors' recent letters to the king, which Catherine could examine herself for their doctrine. Lansac blamed the papal curia and its allies for spreading such rumours in order to encourage the pope to dissolve the Council.⁴⁵ The French ambassadors to the Council in this way appear to operate outside of its inner circle and as victims of its political machinations.

Gillot's presentation of these documents implies that the greater cause of the reform and reunion of the Church suffered because of the marginalisation of the French ambassadors

⁴¹ Gillot, *Actes*, 1–10, 39–41, 49–51.

⁴² Gillot, *Actes*, 3; Tallon, *La France et le Concile de Trente*, 338, 342–3, 394, 827–34.

⁴³ Tallon, *La France et le Concile de Trente*, 346–56.

⁴⁴ Gillot, *Actes*, 21, 125–30, especially 126.

⁴⁵ Gillot, *Actes*, 55–6.

at the Council. Most compellingly, he reproduced both the Latin and French text of the reform programme that the French delegation presented to the Council in January 1563, a comprehensive statement of intent. It listed thirty-four points concerning primarily ecclesiastical discipline and the liturgy, containing “as simply and briefly as possible, everything that seems to us good and necessary for the constitution of Christendom”. Yet the papal curia, its legates, and its allies at the Council regarded this programme as a threat to their authority and submitted the text to point-by-point rebuttal.⁴⁶ Leaving the reform programme to speak for itself, Gillot passed over this failure in silence. The following piece in the compilation presents a letter signed on 15 April 1563 from the king and the Queen Mother to René de Birague, envoy to the Emperor, charging him with advising the Council fathers of the French monarchy’s success in establishing the Peace of Amboise, and with exhorting them similarly to discuss a reform programme in dialogue with the Protestants that might cure the maladies of Christendom.⁴⁷ Gillot thus presented the representatives of the French monarchy as working at the Council for peace, reform, and the reunion of the Church. In response to the monarchy’s exhortations, the papal curia instead attempted to make the French delegation appear to be the stumbling block to reform for its insistence on the defence of Gallican liberties during the debates concerning the reform of the princes in their relation with ecclesiastical authority, which proved particularly fractious in August and September 1563.⁴⁸ The moment of rupture in the French monarchy’s relations with the Council soon followed, in the wake of the Council fathers’ hostile reception to Du Ferrier his speech on 22 September in defence of the privileges of the French monarchy and the liberties of the Gallican Church. Du Ferrier and his fellow ambassadors took the occasion to leave the Council and return to France. Gillot recorded this rupture by including two crucial letters sent by Du Ferrier to the Cardinal of Lorraine on 22 and 23 September, justifying his speech to the

⁴⁶ Gillot, *Actes*, 135–50, especially 144; Tallon, *La France et le Concile de Trente*, 713–5, 842–67.

⁴⁷ Gillot, *Actes*, 151–62; Tallon, *La France et le Concile de Trente*, 392.

⁴⁸ O’Malley, *Trent*, 230–1, 236–7, 250–1.

Council while the Cardinal was in Rome.⁴⁹ By including all of these documents, Gillot's history presented repeated frustrations for the French ambassadors and broken promises by the curia.

The last piece in the collection is dated 9 November 1563, a month before the end of the final period of the Council. It is one of surprisingly few pieces in the volume concerning the Cardinal of Lorraine, who became one of the crucial figures in the third and final period of the Council. Lorraine's role posed major problems of interpretation which Gillot effectively sidestepped, either by choice or for want of sufficient sources. As one of the major instigators of the 1561 Colloquy of Poissy, aspiring to bring about concord between Protestants and Catholics via the Confession of Augsburg, Lorraine arrived at the Council in November 1562 with a reputation for a commitment to wide-ranging reform.⁵⁰ In particular, his openness to reconciliation with the Protestants raised the suspicions of the papal curia.⁵¹ Yet following the news received at Trent on 8 March 1563 of the assassination of his brother, Henri duc de Guise, when Lorraine found himself politically isolated at the Council, he compromised with the papacy in order to secure his goal of reform, following a different course from the French ambassadors particularly in the debate concerning the reform of the princes. Lorraine's new approach culminated in him playing a leading role in the hectic twenty-fifth and final session of the Council in November and December 1563, driving through decrees on Purgatory and the invocation, veneration and relics of the saints, and on sacred images.⁵² It seems that Gillot found it either prudent or necessary to marginalise Lorraine in his account, given the ambiguous, independent role that the Cardinal came to play

⁴⁹ Gillot, *Actes*, 187–195; Tallon, *La France et le Concile de Trente*, 401–2.

⁵⁰ Tallon, *La France et le Concile de Trente*, 356–64; O'Malley, *Trent*, 198–9.

⁵¹ Tallon, *La France et le Concile de Trente*, 365–6; S. Carroll, "The Compromise of Charles Cardinal de Lorraine: New Evidence", *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 54 (2003) 469–83, on pp. 473–5; L. Racaut, "The Sacrifice of the Mass and the Redefinition of Catholic Orthodoxy during the French Wars of Religion", *French History*, 24 (2009) 20–39.

⁵² Tanner (ed.), *Acts of the Ecumenical Councils*, 774–6; Tallon, *La France et le Concile de Trente*, 394–414, 777–94; O'Malley, *Trent*, 235–47.

at the Council. Similarly, Gillot made only minimal efforts to present any perspectives on the Council other than that of the French monarchy. A petition and an oration to the Council by the Imperial ambassadors, as well as letters addressed to Pius IV from the Emperors Ferdinand I and Maximilian II, Archduke Charles II of Austria, and the Albrecht V Duke of Bavaria all appear together at the end of the volume, an addendum to Gillot's otherwise neatly chronological narrative of the French monarchy and its relations with the Council since they date from 1562-4.⁵³ Overall, Gillot presented a partial and flawed history of the Council that primarily relayed the hopes and frustrations of the French monarchy and marginalised its rivals.

Polarizing Responses

Gillot's book hit its targets among the protagonists in the debate concerning the Council in France and prompted polarizing responses. It provoked the condemnation Cardinal Maffeo Barberini, the Papal nuncio to France since November 1604 and the future Pope Urban VIII. Barberini wrote to the Cardinal Nephew Scipione Borghese on 29 May 1607 to express what he called – with restraint – his “sadness and regret” at the appearance of the volume. Despite the anonymous publication, Barberini already knew the identity of its editor and seized its agenda: “Gillot pretends to show that the Council was neither free nor held with the intervention of the French prelates, and that many things were decreed there without regard

⁵³ Gillot, *Actes*, 240–80.

for, or consideration of, the proposals made by the servants of their Kingdom”.⁵⁴ Barberini saw the compilation as working to impede the implementation of the Tridentine decrees, a major aim of the nuncios in France since the end of the Council.⁵⁵ Denouncing the volume’s potential impact, “from the little that I have read”, Barberini decried that “it cannot but cause damage, being enough for the Heretics and Libertines to make use of pretexts, even though false, to bring slanders against ecclesiastical authority”.⁵⁶ Among the piles of publications on the subject of papal authority that year, building up from Venice and England, Gillot contributed another dangerous imprint.⁵⁷

Barberini took action to try to limit the volume’s impact, resorting to the typical “*ad hoc* and *ad hominem*” tactics of early modern book censorship.⁵⁸ He heard that Nicolas de Neufville, sieur de Villeroy, the French Secretary of State, had made moves to censor the volume by writing to the Parisian criminal lieutenant, Jean de Lalemant. Seizing on this response, Barberini insisted “that Gillot should be imprisoned and punished, alleging that it

⁵⁴ ASV, Fondo Borghese, ii, 249, fols. 242r–3v, Barberini to Borghese, 29 May 1607, Soman Collection. “Mi sono anchora doluto con Mons^r Villeroy che Mons^r Gilot, Decano di Langres, Consigliero Ecclesiastico d’una delle Camere di questo Parlamento faceva stampare una raccolta di varie istruzioni date a gl’Ambasciatori Francesi che assistono al Concilio di Trento con le riposte di questi Rè et delle istruzioni date a essi Ambasciatori et altre scritture, col mezzo delle quali pretende il Gilot mostrare che quel Concilio non fusse libero né tenuto con l’intervento de Prelati Francesi, et vi sieno state decretate molte cose senza vedere ò tenersi conto delle proposte fatte per servitio di questo Regno.” On Barberini see Soman, “Book censorship”, 126, and for an overview of the personnel and material conditions of the French nunciature in the early modern period see B. Barbiche, “La nonciature de France aux XVI^e et XVII^e siècles: Les nonces, leur entourage et leur cadre de vie” in A. Koller (ed.), *Kurie und politik: stand und perspektiven der nuntiaturberichtsforschung* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1998) 64–97.

⁵⁵ ASV, Fondo Borghese, ii, 249, fols. 242r–3v, Soman Collection. “Dui possono essere li fini di queste scritture; l’uno d’impedire la publicatione del Concilio di Trento, alla quale, secondo mi dice Mon^r Archivesco d’Ambrun, Sua Maestà si mostrava inclinata; l’altro di far tener qualche conferenza in materia di Religione.” On papal “instructions” to nuncios in France and the importance of the Tridentine decrees in their politics see O. Poncet, “Structure et conjuncture de la representation pontificale en France à l’époque de Paul V (1605-1621)” in A. Koller (ed.), *Die Außenbeziehungen der römischen Kurie unter Paul V. Borghese (1605-1621)* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2008) 143–57, on p. 153; M. François, “La réception du Concile en France sous Henri III” in *Il Concilio di Trento e la Riforma Tridentina: Atti del Convegno Storico Internazionale, Trento, 2-6 Settembre 1563* (Rome: Herder, 1965), i, 395.

⁵⁶ Soman Collection, ASV, Fondo Borghese, ii, 249, fol. 283r, Barberini to Borghese, 26 June 1607, Soman Collection. “Non havevo havuto tempo li leggerle tutte, ma che da quelle poche che havevo letto, non ne poteva risultare se non danno, bastando a gl’Heritici et a Libertini di poter havere de pretesti ancorche falsi da calunniare l’ordine ecclesiastico.”

⁵⁷ Barberini in his capacity as nuncio also wrote to Borghese on affairs in England and especially Venice. See Franceschi, *La crise théologico-politique*, 98–9, 105, 111–4; Franceschi, *Raison d’état, raison d’église*. For a path-breaking account of the “wars of words” in Venice contesting the Interdict see De Vivo, *Information and Communication*, 156–248.

⁵⁸ Soman, “Book Censorship”, 457.

was a bad example not only for the resulting damage to the Catholic Religion, but from a political point of view, in allowing the publication of letters concerning the negotiations made by the Ambassadors of this King”. However he “was not given a satisfying response” as Villeroy “returned to his usual deceptions”.⁵⁹ Next, Barberini related to Borghese in a letter of 12 June 1607 how the attempt at censorship failed, since “it is said to me that the provision was not made in sufficient time, because already several copies had been disseminated, which would be unlikely to be seen again”. Villeroy seemed not to have made much of an attempt to censor Gillot’s publication effectively. Barberini’s contact at the French court remarked that “these writings titled the Acts of the Council of Trent were true, and that they do not appear to be prejudicial”.⁶⁰ As Barberini understood the situation, the French crown did not pursue the censorship of Gillot’s book with sufficient energy, because it was not in its interests to do so. He saw through their cant but was powerless to respond beyond his frustration, and he prudently pursued the issue no further.⁶¹

Worse still for Barberini, the criminal lieutenant’s efforts at censorship spread the renown of Gillot’s publication. Or so reported Pierre de L’Estoile, who greatly admired Gillot’s volume, describing it as “very good and well worth collecting”. On 5 June 1607, he lent the book to his neighbour M. Mesnard, who returned it three days later.⁶² As L’Estoile reported them, the nuncio’s efforts at censorship were all in vain, since by the time his agents knew about Gillot’s authorship, and located Bérion the printer, all the copies were in Gillot’s

⁵⁹ Soman Collection, ASV, Fondo Borghese, ii, 249, fols. 242r–3v, Soman Collection. “Hò rincontro che Mons^r Villeroy scrisse subito al Lugotenente criminale, perche io non havevo havuta notita dello Stampatore, facesse ricerca di chi stampava questa raccolta et n’impedisce la publicatione. Io instai perche il Gilot fusse carcerato e castigato, allegando che era un’ mal esempio non solo per il danno che ne risulta alla Religion Catholica, ma per interesse di politica che si permettesse il divulgar le lettere concernenti i negociati fatti da gl’Ambasciatori di questa Corona. Non mi fù data risposta da appagarsene, ma si recorse a soliti sutterfugii.”

⁶⁰ Soman Collection, ASV, Fondo Borghese, ii, 249, fol. 283r, Soman Collection. “Mi disse che la provisione non era stata in tutto a tempo, perche di già n’erano uscite più copie, ma che non se ne vedrebbero più. Mi soggiunse che queste scritture intitolate Atti del Concilio di Trento erano vero, e che non li pareva che potessero essere pregiudiciale.”

⁶¹ On Barberini’s reluctance to pursue similar lost causes see Soman, “Book censorship”, 143. For the general tenor of instructions to nuncios under Pope Paul V, urging restraint to avoid provoking major opposition, see Poncet, “La représentation pontificale”, 153–4.

⁶² Brunet, viii, 302.

hands. “By this means”, L'Estoile added, the book “was seen everywhere”.⁶³ L'Estoile understood well this routine game of censorship. Reporting the Parisian publication in Latin of James I of England's *Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance* in April 1608, he noted the nuncio's demand that its sale should be banned, “which is a good way to make sure a book sells out quickly”.⁶⁴ For L'Estoile, the success of Gillot's volume among sympathetic readers in part depended on its capacity to rile the nuncio, its vanquished opponent.

Gillot told his more equivocal side of the publication story to Scaliger. Because of the scandal it caused among those who called for the publication of the Tridentine decrees, he acknowledged that his volume threatened the “great friendship” between the King and the Holy See, and he feared that his book and those like it faced daunting obstacles before reaching their readers. Reporting the scandal his volume caused, he concluded: “What can we expect from this state ... Is this not papimania? Is this not book censorship Roman style?”⁶⁵ Perhaps he exaggerated a little here. It is impossible to judge the sincerity behind Villeroy's failed effort at censorship, whether he simply made a show of censoring at the behest of the nuncio, but in practice tacitly permitted publications that did little to harm French national interests.

For Gillot's colleagues in the Parlement of Paris and their allies, the nuncio clearly fell on the losing side of the argument. On 10 June 1607 George Carew, the English ambassador, sent a copy of Gillot's volume to the Secretary of State Robert Cecil, with a description of its favourable reception at the Parlement. He reported “That which mooveth me to send it now is that some of theyre Catholique lawyers here, such as stand for the liberties de l'eglise Gallicane against the Papacy, say that they take it to be (the Bible excepted) one of the best books that ever was published”.⁶⁶ Gillot, writing to Scaliger with

⁶³ Brunet, viii, 299.

⁶⁴ Brunet, ix, 70.

⁶⁵ Scaliger, vii, 185, [1607] 06 06.

⁶⁶ London, The National Archives, Kew, State Papers 78/53, fol. 284r, Soman Collection.

only a touch more modesty, relayed that the volume had been “very well received here by all courageous men, nourished with the ancient laws and old morals of the French; and to the new Frenchmen, who introduce new laws, it is disagreeable ... Our bishops ... are struck by this book on the *Council* and are enraged about it”.⁶⁷ Having riled and outwitted his enemies, Gillot also won over his ideal readers.

Some of those ideal readers furthered Gillot’s work with the acts of the Council, demonstrating the pertinence of his historical approach. Jacques Auguste de Thou, *président* in the Parlement of Paris, reproduced some of the same sources as Gillot in his presentation of the Council in the *History of His Times*, notably the reform programme presented by the French delegation to the Council in January 1563.⁶⁸ In the passages of his *History* concerning the Council, De Thou mentioned that he held original copies of L’Isle’s correspondence and had consulted the papers of Jacques Bongars the French ambassador to the Empire as well as well as the memoirs of Jacques Bourdin, secretary of state.⁶⁹ De Thou proved himself a fierce opponent of the Council when he criticised plans for the publication of the Tridentine decrees in a meeting between Henri IV and office-holders in the Parlement in May 1600.⁷⁰ Wary of papal censorship, however, De Thou omitted the sections on the Council from the first edition of his *History*, and they were only replaced in subsequent editions from the 1620s onwards. Pierre Dupuy, *avocat* in the Parlement and De Thou’s intellectual heir, lamented to Scaliger that De Thou’s initial omission was “a real shame, since there was enough material

⁶⁷ Scaliger, vii, 185, [1607] 06 06.

⁶⁸ On Gillot and De Thou: Picot, *Les français italianisants*, ii, 288; P. Sarpi, *Lettere ai gallicani*, (ed.) B. Ulianich (Wiesbaden: F. Steiner, 1961), lxxxvi. On the January 1563 reform proposals: J.-A. de Thou, *Histoire universelle de Jacques-Auguste de Thou depuis 1543 jusqu'en 1607. Traduite sur l'édition latine de Londres* (London, 1734), iv, 560–65; Gillot, *Actes*, 135–43 for the Latin and 145–50 for his French translation (n.b. the error in pagination so the translation actually covers pp. 145, 140–50); Gillot, *Actes* (second edition), 104–20 with the pagination corrected and the French text appearing before the Latin.

⁶⁹ De Thou, *Histoire universelle*, iv, 334, 590, 592. Perhaps De Thou supplied Gillot with sources for his further expanded *Instructions et missives des roys très chrétiens de France et de leurs ambassadeurs et autres pieces concernant le concile de Trente* ([Paris], 1608): Ulianich (ed.), *Lettere ai gallicani*, lxxxvi. Bibliothèque nationale de France, ms. latin 5978, “I. Aug. Thuani Historiarum Epitomae”, fol. 36v lists among De Thou’s sources “actis Concilii Tridentini publicatus, & literis regiis aliisq. actis & regionum Legatorum orationibus, ac literis, quae penes Iacobu[s] Burdinum unum et iii viris & secretis epistolis remanserunt”.

⁷⁰ Martin *Le gallicanisme et la réforme catholique*, 316–21.

there to fill a whole volume by itself'.⁷¹ Dupuy later acquired De Thou's library and compiled several of these pieces concerning the Council into one of the manuscripts in his erudite collection.⁷² Dupuy published his own volume on the Council by publishing an expanded edition of Gillot's volume on the Council which appeared in 1654.⁷³ Yet the most controversial continuator of Gillot's project for a critical history of the Council based on authentic sources was the Venetian Servite friar Paolo Sarpi, whose *History of the Council of Trent* shaped the negative reception of the history of the Council in the centuries following its publication. Gillot's correspondence with Sarpi grew considerably in the years following the publication of the *Actes du Concile de Trente*, and, in a letter addressed to Jerome Groslet de L'Isle, Sarpi encouraged Gillot in his work preparing an edition of *Traictez des droicts et libertez de l'Eglise gallicane* ([Paris], 1609).⁷⁴ Gillot, De Thou, Dupuy, and Sarpi shared a common conception of the history of the Council as one of missed opportunities and reformist frustrations caused by institutional constraints. Their publications have had a lasting effect on historians' interpretations of the Council and continue to be cited as essential sources with a critical agenda.⁷⁵

As Gillot continued to compile texts in further defence of the rights and liberties of the Gallican Church, he remarked to Scaliger in January 1608 that he had "still enough courage to bestow every year little treatises for our rights and liberties, and good ones; at

⁷¹ On his omission of the passages on the Council see Scaliger, vi, 412, 1605 20 from Pierre Dupuy. On the textual history see S. Kinser, *The Works of Jacques-Auguste de Thou* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1966), 143–4. On Dupuy's inheritance from De Thou see J. Delatour, "Les frères Dupuy (1582-1656)", unpublished thesis for the *diplôme d'archiviste paléographe* at the Ecole nationale des chartes (1996), 171, 188–9.

⁷² Bibliothèque nationale de France, ms. Dupuy 357 includes many pieces of L'Isle's correspondence, listed in L. Dorez, *Catalogue de la Collection Dupuy* (Paris: E. Leroux, 1899), i, 335–6.

⁷³ *Instructions et lettres des rois tres-chrestiens, et de leurs ambassadeurs, et autres pièces concernant le Concile de Trente* (Paris, 1654). Tallon, *La France et le Concile de Trente*, 423 n.1 notes minor errors of chronology in this edition.

⁷⁴ Ulianich (ed.), *Lettere ai gallicani*, lxxxvi–lxxxvii.

⁷⁵ For this interpretation of Sarpi's *History* see D. Wootton, *Paolo Sarpi. Between Renaissance and Enlightenment* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 104–17. On the significance of these sources see Tallon, *La France et le Concile de Trente*, 10–1.

least so that we shall stop our current course and slow down our fall.”⁷⁶ This fall, as Gillot saw it, came in 1615 with the unilateral publication in France of the Tridentine decrees by the Assembly of the Clergy. For Gallicans it was a signal defeat that came after decades of civil war, diplomatic effort, and parliamentary resistance that had hitherto disturbed any plans for the publication of the decrees. Gillot’s compilation of the *Actes du Concile de Trente* made its mark on the debate, provoking the wrath of the nuncio Barberini, and inspiring the resistance of the Gallicans in the Parlement at a time when papal authority once again became a deeply divisive subject in Catholic Europe. Despite defeat on this issue, the integration of Gillot’s documents into successive Gallican histories of the Council by Dupuy and others demonstrates how something of his reckless boast in 1607 was fulfilled: “these texts speak for themselves and make history understood”.⁷⁷

Bibliography

Archival Sources

The National Archives, Kew, SP 78/53, State Papers Foreign, France, 1606-7.

Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris, ms. latin 5978, ‘I. Aug. Thuani Historiarum Epitomae’.

Médiathèque du Grand Troyes, Troyes, ms. 1117, vol. 3 ‘Journal de Pierre de L’Estoile depuis le 17 janvier 1605 jusques au 18 mars 1607’.

Archivio Segreto Vaticano, Vatican City, Fondo Borghese, II, 249.

Jacob Burns Law Library, George Washington University, Soman Collection. Transcriptions of documents concerning print censorship in France during the reign of Henri IV which I have checked against the originals. Footnotes to the present chapter contain the full reference to the original document as well a reference to the transcription in the Soman Collection, which is currently being catalogued.

Printed and Edited Sources

Brunet, P.G. (ed.), *Mémoires-journaux de Pierre de L’Estoile* (Paris: Librairie des bibliophiles, 1878-1896), 12 vols.

⁷⁶ Scaliger, vii, 390, [1608] 01 31.

⁷⁷ Scaliger, vii, 186, 1607 06 06.

- Dorez, L., *Catalogue de la Collection Dupuy* (Paris : E. Leroux, 1899), 3 vols.
- [Dupuy, P. and Gillot, J. eds.], *Instructions et lettres des rois tres-chrestiens, et de leurs ambassadeurs, et autres pièces concernant le Concile de Trente* (Paris, 1654).
- [Gillot, J. (ed.)], *Actes du Concile de Trente en l'an MDLXII & LXIII* ([Paris], 1607).
- [Gillot, J. (ed.)], *Instructions et missiues des roys tres-chrestiens et de leurs ambassadeurs. Et autres pieces concernants le Concile de Trente* ([Paris], 1608, 1613).
- Mignot, E., *Histoire de la réception du Concile de Trente dans les différens Etats Catholiques* (Amsterdam, 1756), 2 vols.
- [Pithou, P.], *Les libertez de l'Eglise Gallicane* (Paris, 1594).
- Sarpi, P., *Histoire du Concile de Trente (Edition originale de 1619)*, trans. P-F. Le Courayer , (eds.) M. Viallon/Bernard Dompnier (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2002).
- Sarpi, P., *Lettere ai gallicani*, (ed.) B. Ulianich (Wiesbaden: F. Steiner, 1961),
- Scaliger, J., *The Correspondence of Joseph Justus Scaliger*, eds. P. Botley/D. van Miert (Geneva: Droz, 2012), 8 vols.
- Tanner, N.P. (ed.), *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils, Volume Two, Trent to Vatican II* (London: Sheed & Ward, 1990).
- Thou, J.-A. de, *Histoire universelle de Jacques-Auguste de Thou depuis 1543 jusqu'en 1607. Traduite sur l'édition latine de Londres* (London, 1734).

Secondary Sources

- Barbiche, B., 'La nonciature de France aux XVIe et XVIIe siècles: Les nonces, leur entourage et leur cadre de vie' in A. Koller (ed.), *Kurie und politik: stand und perspektiven der nuntiaturberichtsforschung* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1998) 64–97.
- Bergin, J., *The Politics of Religion in Early Modern France* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014).
- Bergin, J., *Cardinal de La Rochefoucauld: Leadership and Reform in the French Church* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987).
- Carroll, S., 'The Compromise of Charles Cardinal de Lorraine: New Evidence', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 54 (2003) 469–83.
- Daubresse, S., *Le Parlement de Paris, ou La voix de raison (1559-1589)* (Geneva: Droz, 2005).

- Delatour, J., 'De Pithou à Dupuy: Un siècle de religion politique' in M.-M. Fragonard and P.-E. Leroy (eds.), *Les Pithou: Les lettres et la paix du royaume* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2003) 327–52.
- Delatour, J., 'Les frères Dupuy (1582-1656)', unpublished thesis for the *diplôme d'archiviste paléographe* at the Ecole nationale des chartes (1996).
- Franceschi, S.H. de, *La crise théologico-politique du premier âge baroque. Antiromanisme doctrinal, pouvoir pastoral et raison du prince: Le Saint-Siège face au prisme français (1607-1627)* (Rome: Ecole française de Rome, 2009),
- Franceschi, S.H. de, *Raison d'état et raison d'église. La France et l'Interdit vénitien (1606-1607): Aspects diplomatiques et doctrinaux* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2009).
- François, M., "La réception du Concile en France sous Henri III" in *Il Concilio di Trento e la Riforma Tridentina: Atti del Convegno Storico Internazionale, Trento, 2-6 Settembre 1563*, vol. 1 (Rome: Herder, 1965) 383–400.
- Greengrass, M., *Governing Passions: Peace and Reform in the French Kingdom, 1576-1585* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).
- Greengrass, M., "The Calvinist and the Chancellor: The Mental World of Louis Turquet de Mayerne", *Francia. Forschungen zur Westeuropäischen Geschichte*, 34 (2007) 1–23.
- Grefte, F./Lothe, J., *La vie, les livres et les lectures de Pierre de L'Estoile: Nouvelles recherches* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2002).
- Güttingen, C. von, *Répertoire bibliographique des livres imprimés en France au seizième siècle*, vol. 7 (Baden-Baden: Librairie Heitz, 2001) 163–71.
- Hamilton, T., "Pierre de L'Estoile and his World in the Wars of Religion", unpublished DPhil thesis, University of Oxford (2014).
- Huppert, G., *The Idea of Perfect History: Historical Erudition and Historical Philosophy in Renaissance France* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1970).
- Jostock, I., *La censure négociée: Le contrôle du livre à Genève, 1560-1625* (Geneva : Droz, 2007).
- Jouanna, A., "André Guillart, sieur du Mortier, de l'Isle et de l'Épichelière", in R. Mousnier (ed.), *Le conseil du roi de Louis XII à la Révolution* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1970) 231–53.
- Kelley, D.R., *Foundations of Modern Historical Scholarship: Language, Law, and History in the French Renaissance* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1970).
- Kinser, S., *The Works of Jacques-Auguste de Thou* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1966).
- Le Roux, N., *La faveur du roi: Mignons et courtisans au temps des derniers Valois (vers 1547 - vers 1589)* (Paris: Champ Vallon, 2000).

- Lescaze, B., "L'infortune de Mathieu Berjon et l'ouverture du marché lyonnais, 1600-1625" in R. Durand ed., *C'est la faute à Voltaire, c'est la faute à Rousseau: Recueil anniversaire pour Jean-Daniel Candaux* (Geneva: Droz, 1997) 309–19.
- Martin, V., *Le gallicanisme et la réforme catholique: Essai historique sur l'introduction en France des décrets du concile de Trente (1563-1615)* (Paris: A. Picard, 1919).
- Nicholls, S., "Gallican Liberties and the Catholic League", *History of European Ideas*, 40 (2014) 940–64.
- O'Malley, J., *Trent: What Happened at the Council?* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 2013).
- Parsons, J., *The Church in the Republic: Gallicanism and Political Ideology in Renaissance France* (Washington D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2004).
- Patterson, W.B., *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).
- Picot, E., *Les français italianisants au XVI^e siècle* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1907), 2 vols.
- Posthumus Meyjers, G.H.M., "Jean Hotman's Syllabus of Eirenic Literature" in D. Baker (ed.), *Reform and Reformation: England and the Continent c. 1500-1750* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1979) 175–93.
- Poncet, O., "Structure et conjuncture de la representation pontificale en France à l'époque de Paul V (1605-1621)" in A. Koller (ed.), *Die Außenbeziehungen der römischen Kurie unter Paul V. Borghese (1605-1621)* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2008) 143–57.
- Racaut, L., "The Sacrifice of the Mass and the Redefinition of Catholic Orthodoxy during the French Wars of Religion", *French History*, 24 (2009) 20–39.
- Renouard, P., *Répertoire des imprimeurs parisiens: libraires et fondeurs de caractères en exercice à Paris au XVII^e siècle* (Nogent Le Roi: Jacques Laget, 1995).
- Roberts, P., *Peace and Authority during the French Religious Wars, c.1560-1600* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013).
- Soman, A., "Book Censorship in France (1599-1607) with Emphasis upon the Diplomatic Relations between Paris and Rome", unpublished PhD thesis, Harvard University (1967).
- Tallon, A., *La France et le Concile de Trente (1518-1563)* (Rome: Ecole Française de Rome, 1997).
- Tarrête, A., "Un gallican sous la Ligue: Guillaume du Vair (1555-1621)", *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, 3 (2009) 497–516.
- Trevor-Roper, H., *Europe's Physician: The Various Life of Sir Theodore de Mayerne* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006).

Venard, M., “Le projet d’un nouveau concile dans la France d’Henri IV” in Marie Viallon (ed.), *Autour du Concile de Trente: actes de la table ronde de Lyon, 28 février 2003* (Saint Etienne: Publications de l’université de Saint-Etienne, 2006) 47–60.

Vivanti, C., *Guerre civile et paix religieuse dans la France d’Henri IV*, trans. L.-A. Sanchi (Paris: Desjonqueres, 2006, first Italian edition, 1963)

Vivo, F. de, “Francia e Inghilterra di fronte all’Interdetto di Venezia” in M. Viallon (ed.), *Paolo Sarpi: Politique et religion en Europe* (Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2010) 163–88.

Vivo, F. de, *Information and Communication in Venice: Rethinking Early Modern Politics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

Wootton, D., *Paolo Sarpi. Between Renaissance and Enlightenment* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983),